1		
2	Mark A. Schadrack (CA SBN 120171) SCHADRACK & CHAPMAN, LLP	
3	28202 Cabot Road, Suite 300 Laguna Niguel, CA 92677	
4	Mark A. Schadrack (CA SBN 120171) SCHADRACK & CHAPMAN, LLP 28202 Cabot Road, Suite 300 Laguna Niguel, CA 92677 Phone (949) 498-3203 Fax (949) 365-7098	
5		
6	Allan E. Anderson (CA SBN 133672) ROPERS, MAJESKI, KOHN & BENTL 515 South Flower Street, Suite 2100	EY
7	Phone (213) 312-2000	
8	Fax (213) 312-2001	
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff, Counter-Defendation Third-Party Defendant CYCLONE USA TORNADO AIR MANAGEMENT SYS	nt and , INC. dba
10	TORNADO AIR MANAGEMENT SYS and Third-Party Defendant JAY KIM	TEMS
11		
12		
13	INTERSTATES	DISTRICT COURT
14	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
15	CENTRAL DISTRI	CT OF CALIFORNIA
16		
17	CYCLONE USA, INC., a Nevada	Case No. CV 03-0992 AJW
18	corporation,	Case Ivo. C v 05-0992 AJ vv
19	Plaintiff,	PLAINTIFF'S BRIEF REGARDING
20	v.	THE FURTHER ACCOUNTING; SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF
21	LL&C DEALER SERVICES, LLC, a California corporation, et al.	DARYL MARTIN
22	Defendants.	
23		Date: May 20, 2008 Time: 10:00 a.m.
24		Ctrm: 690
25	AND RELATED COUNTER- COMPLAINT AND THIRD-PARTY	
26	COMPLAINT TIME TAKET	
27		
28		

I. BACKGROUND.

On November 8, 2007, the Court issued a detailed Memorandum of Decision. Among other things, the Court ruled in favor of plaintiff on its federal trademark infringement and counterfeiting claims against Sei Kim and LL&C. (Memorandum of Decision at pages 4-30 and 49-55.) With respect to damages, the Court accepted plaintiff's computation of 2003 profits and Poron-related profits, as well as plaintiff's "request for an accounting of LL&C's profits from January 1, 2004 to the present" (Memorandum of Decision at page 22, lines 15-18.)

The parties to this case agreed to submit the further accounting to the Court through briefing and declarations, in lieu of live testimony. (Stipulation and Proposed Scheduling Order filed on or about January 18, 2008.) In its Order, dated January 22, 2008, the Court accepted the parties' proposed briefing schedule.

II. GENERAL LEGAL PRINCIPLES.

"In assessing profits the plaintiff shall be required to prove defendant's sales only; defendant must prove all elements of cost or deduction claimed." 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)(3). "Any doubts about the actual amount profits will be resolved against the infringer." *H-D Michigan, Inc. v. Bikers Dream, Inc.*, 48 U.S.P.Q.2d 1108 (C.D. Cal. 1998) (citing *Louis Vuitton, S.A. v. Spencer Handbags Corp.*, 765 F.2d 966, 972-973 (2nd Cir. 1985); McCarthy on Trademarks § 30:66 (4th ed. 1998)).

incurred in the trademark case are not deductible. Wolfe v. National Lead Co., 272 F.2d 867, 873 (9th Cir. 1959) (citing Duro Co. v. Duro Co., 56 F.2d 313 (3rd Cir. 1932); Champion Spark Plug Co. v. Sanders, 108 F. Supp. 674 (E.D.N.Y. 1952)), overruled on other grounds by Maier Brewing Co. v. Fleischmann Distilling Corp., 359 F.2d 156 (9th Cir. 1966), cert. denied, 362 U.S. 950 (1960).

III. LL&C'S PROFITS.

Attached hereto as Exhibit A, is a true and correct copy of a report prepared by the damages expert witness who testified on behalf of plaintiff at the trial (Daryl Martin). Mr. Martin has concluded LL&C's profits from the sale of infringing products during the period at issue (2004-2007) are \$449,219. (Exhibit A at page 4.)

As set forth in the Court's Memorandum of Decision, "Sei Kim directly and contributorily infringed Cyclone USA's trademarks during the period when the contract between Sei Kim and LL&C was in force. Therefore, to the extent that LL&C is liable to Cyclone USA for trademark infringement during that time, Sei Kim is also personally liable to Cyclone USA." (Memorandum of Decision at page 53, lines 10-14.) All of the fuel saving devices, upon which the further accounting is based, were sold to LL&C by Sei Kim. (Largent Deposition transcript, page 5,

line 23 through page 7, line 4.) Thus, Sei Kim is personally liable for the additional damages described in Mr. Martin's supplemental report. CONCLUSION. IV. Based on the above, plaintiff respectfully requests an award of further profits in the amount of \$449,219, plus interest. Dated: March 19, 2008 SCHADRACK & CHAPMAN, LLP Attorneys for Plaintiff, Counter-Defendant and Third-Party Defendant CYCLONE USA, INC. dba TORNADO AIR MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS and Third-Party Defendant JAY KIM ¹A true and correct copy of the relevant excerpts from Mr. Largent's deposition transcript are attached hereto as Exhibit B.

DECLARATION OF DARYL MARTIN

- 1. I oversee the valuation division at CONSOR Intellectual Asset

 Management in La Jolla, California. I have over 10 years of financial analysis and
 valuation experience. Details regarding my experience are set forth in Appendix A
 of the report described below.
- 2. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of my Supplemental Report in this action. As set forth in my report, it is my professional opinion that LL&C's profits from the sale of infringing products from 2004-2007 were \$449,219. (Exhibit A at page 2.)
- 3. In order to calculate the profits, I first determined the net revenues generated from the sale of the Tornado fuel savers. (Exhibit A at page 3.)
- 4. Next, I analyzed LL&C's reported expenses and determined certain adjustments should be made. (Exhibit A at pages 3-4.)
- 5. After making adjustments for entertainment expenses, fuel expenses and legal expenses, I calculated adjusted net profit for each of the four years at issue. (Exhibit A at page 5.) Adding the adjusted net profit for each of the four years yields the total sum of \$449,219.
- 6. I also calculated interest accrued to date on the foregoing amount, as well as the amounts already awarded on the infringement claims. (Exhibit A at pages 5-6.) Additionally, I have determined the daily rate of interest that will continue to accrue on a going forward basis. (Exhibit A at page 7.)

7. Attached hereto as Exhibit B are true and correct copies of excerpts from the deposition transcript of LL&C's managing member (Randy Largent).

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: March 19, 2008

EXHIBIT A TO TO PLAINTIFF'S BRIEF REGARDING THE FURTHER ACCOUNTING

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CYCLONE USA, INC.,	}		Certified Copy
PLAINTIFF,)		
VS.)	NO.	CV 03-0992 AJW
LL&C DEALER SERVICES, LLC,)		
ET AL.,		·	
DEFENDANTS.)		
AND RELATED COUNTER-COMPLAINTS)		
AND THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT.)		

DEPOSITION OF RANDY LARGENT TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 2008

REPORTED BY:

DENISE J. PAGANO

CSR NO. 7233, RPR





1545 Sawtelle Blvd. Suite 26 Los Angeles CA 90025 phone 310.231.4333 or 800.373.0888 fax 310.231.4332 www.watsoncsr.com

EXHIBIT B. PAGE_

-	Page 5
1	IF YOU MAKE ANY CHANGES OR CORRECTIONS TO YOUR
2	TESTIMONY, THAT COULD HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON YOUR
3	BELIEVABILITY AS A WITNESS.
· 4	DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?
5	A YES.
6	Q AND AS A RESULT OF THAT, IT'S IMPORTANT THAT YOU
7	UNDERSTAND MY QUESTIONS, AND THAT IF YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND
8 .	THEM, YOU LET ME KNOW.
9	IF YOU DON'T SAY ANYTHING, I'M GOING TO ASSUME THAT
10	YOU UNDERSTOOD THE QUESTION, OKAY?
11	A YES.
12	Q WHAT'S YOUR CURRENT POSITION AT LL&C?
13	A MANAGING PARTNER.
14	Q IS THERE MORE THAN ONE MANAGING PARTNER, OR ARE YOU
15	THE ONLY MANAGING PARTNER?
16	A I'M THE ONLY ONE.
17	Q AND BY THAT, DO YOU MEAN MANAGING MEMBER?
18	A YES.
19	Q ARE YOU STILL A 60 PERCENT OWNER OF LL&C?
20	A YES.
21	Q AND IS MR. CHALDEKAS A 40 PERCENT OWNER STILL?
22	A YES.
23	Q FROM THE BEGINNING OF 2004, UP UNTIL THE PRESENT,
24	WHO WERE YOU PURCHASING THE PRODUCTS YOU SOLD UNDER THE
25	TORNADO FUELSAVER NAME FROM?

	Page 6
1	A SEI KIM.
2	Q HAS THAT EVER CHANGED DURING THAT TIME PERIOD, 2004
3	UP TO THE PRESENT?
. 4	A NO.
5	Q AT ONE POINT, THERE WAS A WRITTEN CONTRACT BETWEEN
6	YOUR COMPANY AND SEI KIM.
7	WAS THAT CONTRACT EVER MODIFIED OR REPLACED
8	A UM
9	Q OR EXTENDED?
10	A THERE WERE SEVERAL MINOR ADDITIONS TO THE CONTRACT
11	THAT BASICALLY ADDRESSED THE NUMBER OF UNITS THAT WE WOULD
12	BUY FROM HIM, BUT THAT WAS REALLY YOU KNOW, THERE WERE
13	JUST KIND OF ONE OR TWO PAGES.
14	Q WHAT I'M MORE INTERESTED IN IS WHETHER THERE WAS
15	ANY SORT OF AN EXTENSION OF THAT AGREEMENT. I DON'T RECALL
16 .	THE DATE THAT IT EXPIRED, BUT I KNOW IT'S BEFORE TODAY, AND
17	I'M WONDERING
18	A I THINK IT'S EXPIRED.
19	Q DO YOU RECALL WHEN IT EXPIRED?
20	A NO, I REALLY DON'T.
21	Q WAS THERE ANYTHING IN WRITING TO EXTEND THE
22	AGREEMENT AFTER IT EXPIRED?
23	A NO.
24	Q WAS THERE EVER A NEW AGREEMENT WRITTEN?
25	A NO.

	Page 7
1	Q ARE YOU SAYING THAT, REGARDLESS OF THE EXPIRATION
2	OF THE ORIGINAL AGREEMENT, YOUR COMPANY CONTINUED TO
3	
	PURCHASE THOSE UNITS FROM SEI KIM'S COMPANY?
4	A YES.
5	Q OKAY: HOW ARE YOU AND MR. CHALDEKAS COMPENSATED
6	FROM LL&C?
7	A INFREQUENTLY. I'M NOT WHAT I'M SORRY. I'M
8	NOT UNDERSTANDING WHAT YOU'RE
9	Q WHAT I'M TRYING TO FIND OUT IS HOW YOU AND
10	MR. CHALDEKAS GET PAID BY LL&C, IF ANYTHING?
11	A IF THERE IS MONEY THERE, MY BOOKKEEPER WRITES A
12	CHECK. I TELL HER TO WRITE A CHECK, AND SHE WRITES A CHECK.
13	Q IS THAT IN THE FORM OF DRAWS?
14	A I SUPPLIED A LIST THAT SHOWED AND, FRANKLY, I'M
15	NOT SURE. SOME OF THEM WERE DRAWS. SOME OF THEM SHOWED
16	WE PUT QUITE A BIT OF MONEY IN THE COMPANY. I THINK IT WAS
17	'03, '04 OR '05, SO A PORTION OF IT WAS A RETURN, A
18	REPAYMENT OF LOAN, AND A PORTION OF IT WAS DRAWS, BUT THAT'S
19	OUTLINED AS I THINK IN THAT REPORT THAT I GAVE YOU.
20	MR. SCHADRACK: LET'S GO OFF THE RECORD FOR A SECOND.
21	(DISCUSSION OFF THE RECORD.)
22	MR. SCHADRACK: OKAY. LET'S GO BACK ON THE RECORD.
23	I'M GOING TO ASK THE REPORTER TO MARK AS
24	EXHIBIT NUMBER 1 A DOCUMENT, WHICH IS A SIX-PAGE DOCUMENT,
25	WHICH ACTUALLY CONSISTS OF TWO DOCUMENTS; AND THE FIRST ONE
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Page 12 BY MR. SCHADRACK: WOULD YOU PLEASE TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 2 3 AFTER IT HAS BEEN MARKED BY THE COURT REPORTER. DO YOU RECOGNIZE THIS DOCUMENT? YES. A AND WHAT DOES THIS DOCUMENT REFLECT? 6 Α LEGAL FEES. FROM 2004 THROUGH 2007? YES. 10 FOR LL&C? Q 11 A YES. 12 MR. SCHADRACK: I'D LIKE THE REPORTER TO MARK AS 13 EXHIBIT NUMBER 3 A DOCUMENT ENTITLED, "LL&C DEALER SERVICES" 14 COMMA "LLC PROFIT AND LOSS JANUARY 2004 THROUGH DECEMBER 15 2007." IT'S A THREE-PAGE DOCUMENT. 16 (PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 3 WAS MARKED FOR 17 IDENTIFICATION BY THE COURT REPORTER.) 18 BY MR. SCHADRACK: 19 PLEASE TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 3 AFTER IT HAS 20 BEEN MARKED BY THE COURT REPORTER. 21 IF YOU LOOK ON PAGE 2 OF EXHIBIT NUMBER 3 -- LET ME 22 BACK UP. 23 THIS EXHIBIT NUMBER 3 IS THE PROFIT AND LOSS 24 STATEMENT FOR LL&C FROM JANUARY OF '04 THROUGH DECEMBER OF 25 2007, CORRECT?

Page 13 YES. Α TAKE A LOOK AT PAGE 2 TOWARD THE MIDDLE UNDER, 3 "PROFESSIONAL FEES." THERE ARE LEGAL FEES. DO YOU SEE THAT? Α YES. 6 Q AND THERE IS A NUMBER THERE OF APPROXIMATELY 7 \$741,000. DO YOU SEE THAT? A YES. 10 BUT ON EXHIBIT 2, THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF LEGAL FEES IS 11 ONLY APPROXIMATELY 344,000. 12 DO YOU SEE THAT ON PAGE 4? 13 A I'M SORRY. WHERE ARE WE LOOKING? 14 ON EXHIBIT 2, THE TRANSACTION DETAIL BY ACCOUNT. Q 15 Α RIGHT. 16 DO YOU KNOW WHY THERE IS THAT LARGE OF A DIFFERENCE 17 BETWEEN THE LEGAL FEES REFLECTED ON THE PROFIT AND LOSS 18 STATEMENT AND THE TRANSACTION DETAIL BY ACCOUNT? 19 Α NO. 20 WHAT PORTION OF THE LEGAL FEES LISTED IN THE PROFIT 21 AND LOSS STATEMENT APPLY TO THE TORNADO LITIGATION? 22 KIND OF A ROUGH GUESS, BUT I'D SAY ABOUT 23 80 PERCENT, 80, 85 PERCENT. 24 0 THAT'S A ROUGH ESTIMATE? 25 YEAH, I THINK THAT'S ABOUT APPROXIMATELY RIGHT.

		Page 14
1	Q	LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT 2 FOR A MINUTE.
2		THE MEMO PORTION IS CUT OFF A LITTLE BIT, BUT WE
3	CAN SEE	PART OF THAT ON THERE, AND I'D JUST LIKE TO KIND OF
4	RUN THRO	UGH THAT A LITTLE BIT.
5		THE FIRST
6	A	WHICH? I'M SORRY, MARK. WHICH ONE IS 2?
7	· Q	EXHIBIT 2, THE DETAIL BY ACCOUNT.
8	A	THIS ONE?
9	Q	LEGAL FEES.
10		YES.
11	A.	OKAY. I'M SORRY.
12	Q	THAT'S ALL RIGHT.
13	A	ин-нин.
14	Q	OKAY. THE FIRST ENTRY, "ANDREW KIM & ASSOCIATES,
15	CLIENT T	RUST ACCOUNT," THERE IS A REFERENCE TO "JAY KIM
16	LAWSUIT"	
17	A	UH-HUH.
18	Q	IN THE MEMO SECTION.
19	А	ин-нин.
20	Q	WHAT DOES THAT REFER TO?
21		IS THAT THE TORNADO LITIGATION?
22	А	I ASSUME SO, YES.
23	Q	THEN THE NEXT ITEM REFERS TO "BOND SERVICES OF
24	CALIFORN	IA LLC."
25		WHAT'S THAT REFERRING TO?

		Page 15
1	A	WE HAD TO HAVE A BOND.
2	Q	OH, IS THAT FOR THE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION?
3		DO YOU KNOW?
4	A	I BELIEVE SO, YEAH, SOMETHING LIKE THAT.
5	Q	OKAY. THE NEXT REFERENCE IS BOULT, B-O-U-L-T, WADE
6	TENNANT,	T-E-N-N-A-N-T.
7		DO YOU SEE THAT?
8	A	YES.
9	Q	WHAT DOES THAT REFER TO?
10	A	THAT WAS FOR LEGAL WORK IN EUROPE.
11	Q	DID THAT HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH THE TORNADO
12	FUELSAVE	R DEVICE OR WHY DON'T YOU COULD YOU TELL ME
13	AHT THW	T WORK PERTAINS TO?
14		MAYBE THAT'S AN EASIER WAY TO
15	А	THAT WAS FOR CYCLONE.
16	Q	WHEN YOU SAY, "CYCLONE," WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY THAT?
17	А	SEI KIM'S PRODUCT IS CALLED, "CYCLONE."
18	Q	AND WHAT TYPE OF LEGAL WORK WAS BEING DONE WITH
19	RESPECT	TO THE CYCLONE PRODUCT?
20	А	I BELIEVE IT WAS TRADEMARK.
21	Q	LIKE A REGISTRATION OF A TRADEMARK?
22	A	YES, I BELIEVE THAT'S WHAT IT WAS.
23	Q	DOES LL&C LET ME RESTATE THE QUESTION.
24		DID LL&C EVER SELL UNDER THE TORNADO FUELSAVER NAME
25	IN THE U	K?

)

		Page 16
1	A	NOT THAT I'M AWARE OF.
2	Q	WAS IT ONLY THE CYCLONE OR CYCLONE FUELSAVER NAME?
3	A	YES.
4	Q	THE NEXT ENTRY IS FOR BURHENN & GEST, AND THE FIRST
5	SEVERAL	ENTRIES REFER TO "LAWSUIT RE:"
6		DO YOU KNOW WHAT LAWSUIT THAT'S REFERRING TO?
7	A	THIS ONE.
8	Q	AND WHEN YOU SAY, "THIS ONE," YOU MEAN THE TORNADO
9	LITIGATI	ON?
10	А	CYCLONE TORNADO, YES.
11	Q	AND THEN THERE IS AN ENTRY FOR TRUCK INSURANCE.
12		DO YOU SEE THAT?
13	А	YES.
14	Q	DO YOU KNOW WHAT THAT IS?
15	A	THERE WAS SOMETHING TO DO WITH TRUCK THAT HOWARD
16	DID A L	TTLE BIT OF WORK ON. I DON'T RECALL THE SPECIFICS
17	OF IT.	
18	Q	DO YOU KNOW IF THAT WAS THE INSURANCE COVERAGE
19	LITIGAT	ON THAT TRUCK COMMENCED IN STATE COURT?
20		I'M NOT ASKING YOU TO GUESS.
21	A	YEAH, I DON'T KNOW. I REALLY DON'T KNOW. I I
22	DON'T KI	. WON
23	Q	THEN THERE IS A CASE NUMBER BC.
24		DO YOU KNOW WHAT THAT IS?
25	A	NO.

EXHIBIT B. PAGE 49

	Page 17
1.	Q AND THEN THERE IS REFERENCE TO "JAY LAWSUIT."
2	IS THAT THE SAME THING AS THE TORNADO
3	A YES.
4	Q CYCLONE LITIGATION?
5	. A YES.
6	Q THEN THERE IS TWO REFERENCES REGARDING I'M
7	SORRY. LET ME BACK UP.
8	THERE IS THE NEXT ENTRY IS FOR JOHN MITCHELL?
9	A UH-HUH.
10	Q AND THERE IS A REFERENCE TO "COLLECTIONS" FOR
11	THAT.
12	DO YOU KNOW WHAT THAT IS?
13	A WE HAD SOMEBODY THAT WE HAD SOLD SOME PRODUCT TO
14	THAT DIDN'T PAY US.
15	Q WHAT TYPE OF PRODUCT?
16	WAS IT TORNADO FUELSAVER?
17	A I THINK IT WAS FUELSAVERS AND MAYBE SOME SOME
18	WE HAD THOSE LITTLE THINGS YOU SCREW ON YOUR TIRES TO TELL
19	YOUR TIRE PRESSURE. I CAN'T THINK
20	Q TIRE MINDER?
21	MR. LANGLEY: TIRE MINDER.
22	THE WITNESS: TIRE MINDER, YEAH.
23	BY MR. SCHADRACK:
24	Q THE NEXT ONE IS JOSEPH BERTROCHE,
25	B-E-R-T-R-O-C-H-E.

	Page 18
1	DO YOU KNOW WHAT THAT IS?
2	A I THINK IT'S A SIMILAR THING.
3	Q COLLECTION TYPE THING?
4	A. I THINK SO, BUT I CAN'T RECALL.
5	Q AND THEN THERE IS A HANDFUL OF ENTRIES WITH RESPECT
6	TO THE PROCOPIO FIRM.
7	DO YOU SEE THOSE?
8	A YES.
9	Q AND THOSE PERTAIN TO THE JAY KIM LAWSUIT; IS THAT
10	CORRECT?
11	A YES.
12	Q WHICH IS THE SAME THING AS THE TORNADO LITIGATION,
13	CORRECT?
14	A YES.
. 15	Q AND THEN THERE IS REFERENCES TO SIDLEY AUSTIN.
16	DO YOU SEE THOSE?
17	A YES.
18	Q AND THOSE REFER TO AFTER "JAY LAWSUIT," THERE IS
19	CLIENT NUMBERS.
. 20	DO YOU KNOW WHAT THOSE PAYMENTS ARE FOR?
21	A THE THE WHEN WE WENT TO IN WASHINGTON, THE
22	APPEAL. I DON'T RECALL WHAT WHAT HOW YOU REFER TO
23	THAT.
24	MR. LANGLEY: APPEAL.
25	///

Page 19 BY MR. SCHADRACK: SO SIDLEY AUSTIN WAS RETAINED BY LL&C FOR THE APPEAL THAT WAS FILED IN THIS CASE? IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE SAYING? 5 A THE -- I BELIEVE IT WAS TRADEMARK, OR I DON'T 6 RECALL EXACTLY, BUT THERE WAS SOMETHING THAT WENT TO 7 WASHINGTON, AND HOWARD HAD SIDLEY & AUSTIN HANDLE IT. AND THAT WAS THE APPEAL IN THIS CASE, CORRECT? A I BELIEVE SO. 10 THE ONE IN WASHINGTON? Q 11 A YES. 12 VAN DORN & MARSHAK, WHAT WERE THEY USED FOR? Q 13 IT LOOKS LIKE A LOT OF DIFFERENT THINGS. 14 A LOT OF DIFFERENT THINGS. A 15 WERE THEY USED FOR THIS CASE AT ALL? 16 Α VERY SMALL AMOUNT. 17 AND CAN YOU TELL ME WHICH ITEMS ON HERE THAT WOULD Q 18 REFER TO? 19 IS IT INCLUDED IN THE MISCELLANEOUS STUFF? 20 I CAN'T REALLY TELL YOU WHICH ONES SPECIFICALLY 21 WOULD --22 WHAT ABOUT THE LAST ENTRY ON PAGE 2, "SEI 23 KIM/TSC"? 24 DO YOU KNOW WHAT THAT IS? 25 A NO, I DON'T.

P	
	Page 20
1	MR. LANGLEY: I DIDN'T SEE THAT ONE.
2	THE WITNESS: (WITNESS INDICATING.)
3,	MR. LANGLEY: OH, LET ME SEE.
4	THE WITNESS: SECOND PAGE.
5	BY MR. SCHADRACK:
6	Q ON PAGE 3, ON 12/2/04, THERE IS A REFERENCE TO "SEI
7	KIM PROCO."
8	DO YOU SEE THAT ONE? 12/2/04?
9	A 12/2/04?
10	MR. LANGLEY: THIS ONE.
11	THE WITNESS: THAT ONE?
12	BY MR. SCHADRACK:
13	Q IT'S THE SECOND 12/2/04 ENTRY.
14	A RIGHT.
15	Q DO YOU KNOW WHAT THAT ONE IS, THE "SEI KIM PROCO"?
16	A NO.
17	Q PARDON?
18	A NO.
19	Q THEN THERE IS SOME ENTRIES FOR VENABLE LLP.
20	WHAT WERE THEY USED FOR?
21	A THOSE WERE COMPLIANCE ISSUES WITH REGARD TO THE
22	INFOMERCIAL.
23	Q YOU MEAN THE TORNADO INFOMERCIAL?
24	A YES.
25	Q WHAT TYPES OF COMPLIANCE ISSUES?
1	

	Page 21
1	A THERE IS A GOVERNING BODY IN NA THE NATIONAL
2	BROADCASTING I CAN'T RECALL THAT ALWAYS LOOKS AT
3	INFOMERCIALS. THEY WILL COME IN, AND THEY'LL SAY, "WE WANT
4	MORE CLAIMS," OR "WE WANT YOU TO PUT SOME WORDING ON THERE
5	THAT DISCLAIMS WHAT YOU'RE SAYING."
6	IT'S FAIRLY COMMON, SO WE USE VENABLE TO HELP US
7	MAKE SURE WE WERE IN COMPLIANCE.
8	Q AFTER "VENABLE LLP," THERE IS A FIRM, VENABLE
9	BAETJER
10	A YES.
11	Q ET CETERA.
12	WHAT WERE THEY USED FOR?
13	A THEY'RE THE SAME PEOPLE.
14	Q WERE THEY USED FOR THE SAME THING AS FAR AS THESE
15	REFERENCES GO?
16	A YES.
17	Q OKAY. AND THEN THERE IS WANDERER AND WANDERER.
18	WHAT WERE THEY USED FOR?
19	A I HAVE NO IDEA.
20	Q AND THEN, "WFB-M/C," DO YOU KNOW WHAT THAT IS?
21	A WELL, IT LOOKS LIKE IT'S A BOND SERVICE PAYMENT
22	MADE ON A CREDIT CARD.
23	Q DOES "M/C" REFER TO "MASTER CHARGE"?
24	A YES.
25	Q OR MASTERCARD?

Page 22 1 WHAT'S "WFB" STAND FOR? WELLS FARGO BANK. MR. SCHADRACK: I'D LIKE THE REPORTER TO MARK AS EXHIBIT 3 NUMBER 4 A MULTIPLE-PAGE DOCUMENT ENTITLED, "REVENUE SPLIT" 5 ON THE FIRST PAGE. (PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 4 WAS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION BY THE COURT REPORTER.) 8 BY MR. SCHADRACK: PLEASE TAKE A LOOK AT EXHIBIT NUMBER 2 AFTER IT HAS 9 10 BEEN MARKED BY THE COURT REPORTER. 11 DO YOU RECOGNIZE THIS DOCUMENT? 12 YES. Α 13 Q WHAT DOES THIS DOCUMENT REFLECT? IT BREAKS DOWN THE REVENUE, THE AREAS WHERE THE 14 15 REVENUE CAME FROM. SO IF WE LOOK AT ITEM NUMBER -- EXCUSE ME. IF WE 16 LOOK AT YEAR 2004, THE FIRST LISTING OF THE REVENUE SPLIT --17 18 A UH-HUH. -- IT SAYS, "FULFILLMENT INCOME" APPROXIMATELY 19 20 \$385,000. THEN "NON-TORNADO" APPROXIMATELY \$40,000. 21 DOES THAT MEAN THAT EVERYTHING OTHER THAN THE APPROXIMATELY \$40,000 FROM YOUR SALES INCOME WAS TORNADO --23 WAS FROM TORNADO PRODUCTS? 24 WELL, SOME OF THE FULFILLMENT -- SOME OF THE Α FULFILLMENT INCOME WOULD BE FROM TORNADO. WE WEREN'T ABLE

)

ř